

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY DOMINICK,  
Petitioner

Case No. 20-mc-80001-DMR

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED  
AS FRIVOLOUS**

Petitioner Anthony Dominick, Jr. filed this miscellaneous case on January 6, 2020, apparently seeking a declaration of sovereign citizenship. [Docket No. 1 (“Petition”).] Under a sovereign citizen theory, U.S. citizenship is contractual and therefore optional. *Bryant v. Washington Mut. Bank*, 524 F. Supp. 2d 753, 758 (W.D. Va. 2007), *aff’d*, 282 F. App’x 260 (4th Cir. 2008); *Vazquez v. California Highway Patrol*, No. 15-cv-330 YGR, 2015 WL 1743275, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2015) (stating that sovereign citizens “generally contend that most if not all of the state and federal government, statutory structure, and legal system is invalid or illegitimate, or at least that individuals can essentially opt out of the rules of society through convoluted legalistic loopholes”).

A belief of some sovereign citizens is that “the U.S. government created individual treasury accounts for each U.S. citizen in the 1930s . . . .” *United States v. Singleton*, No. 03-CR-175, 2004 WL 1102322, at \*2 (N.D. Ill. May 7, 2004). The purpose of the trust accounts is apparently to “pledge [U.S. citizens] and their property . . . as security for the national debt in exchange for the benefits of citizenship.” *Bryant*, 524 F. Supp. 2d at 758. The theory holds that an individual may revoke the citizenship contract imposed upon them at birth and thus regain the profits of their individual federal trust accounts. *See id.* The current petition appears to request such relief, since Mr. Dominick attached to his complaint a form entitled a Notice of Claim for Return of Property

1 addressed to the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury.

2 Federal courts have unanimously held that sovereign citizen arguments are meritless. *See*  
3 *United States v. Coleman*, 871 F.3d 470, 476 (6th Cir. 2017) (citing cases), *Bryant*, 524 F. Supp. 2d  
4 at 758 (“The foundation of [a sovereign citizenship] claim is equal parts revisionist legal history and  
5 conspiracy theory.”); *Vazquez*, 2015 WL 1743275, at \*2 (“As far as the undersigned is aware, no  
6 court to consider [sovereign citizen] arguments has found any merit in them whatsoever.”); *Gravatt*  
7 *v. United States*, 100 Fed. Cl. 279, 288 (2011) (“It strains all logic and reason to believe that the  
8 trust fund alleged by plaintiff actually exists.”). Mr. Dominick does not cite any authority  
9 supporting the existence of the alleged trust account or the ability of this court to order such relief.

10 Accordingly, the court orders Mr. Dominick to respond in writing and explain why this case  
11 should not be dismissed for failure to state a legally cognizable claim. Any response is due no later  
12 than **February 18, 2020**. If Mr. Dominick does not file a timely response, his case may be dismissed  
13 for failure to prosecute. The court refers Mr. Dominick to the section “Representing Yourself” on  
14 the Court’s website, located at <http://cand.uscourts.gov/proselitigants>, as well as the Court’s Legal  
15 Help Centers for unrepresented parties. In San Francisco, the Legal Help Center is located on the  
16 15th Floor, Room 2796, of the United States Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco.  
17 In Oakland, the Legal Help Center is located on the 4th Floor, Room 470S, of the United States  
18 Courthouse, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland.

19  
20  
21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 Dated: February 4, 2020



23 DONNA M. RYU  
24 United States Magistrate Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28